#### HOUSEHOLD ANALYSIS REVIEW GROUP:

Minutes for the meeting of January 14<sup>th</sup> 2004 Conference room 9, Victoria Quay, 2-4pm

### **Present:**

Duncan Gray (Chairman) Scottish Executive Development Department

**Analytical Services Division** 

Elizabeth Fraser Scottish Executive Development Department

**Analytical Services Division** 

Jan FreekeGlasgow City CouncilSteve MorleyNorth Ayrshire CouncilSara GraingerCommunities Scotland

Alistair Harvey City of Edinburgh Council

Stephen Fraser Stirling Council

Tom Snowling Aberdeen City Council
Blair Melville Homes for Scotland

Cecilia Macintyre General Register Office for Scotland

Derek Neill North Lanarkshire Council

Jan Young Scottish Executive Development Department

**Analytical Services Division** 

**Apologies:** 

Helen Wood Scottish Executive Development Department

Planning Services Division

Gillian Miller Scottish Executive Development Department

**Analytical Services Division** 

## AGENDA ITEMS 1 AND 2: INTRODUCTIONS, APOLOGIES, MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING AND MATTERS ARISING

- 1.1 The Chairman welcomed members of the group to the meeting. There had been a few changes to the group and so members introduced themselves.
- 1.2 Jan Freeke asked when data from the 2001 Vacant Follow up Survey was likely to become available. Elizabeth Fraser explained that a few details were still to be tied up but hopefully, data should be available around mid February
- 1.3 No further work has been done on Institutional population. It was stated that while this piece of work is not a top priority, it should not be forgotten about. A proposal for how to deal with the Institutional population to be drawn up in time for the next HARG meeting [Action: Scottish Executive]
- 1.4 Following Celia's move to GRO(S) discussions were being held within SE between Central Statistics Unit, GRO(S) and Housing Statistics on ways in which work on neighbourhood level household estimates might be organised in future. There was general agreement that a great deal might be gained from drawing together work on data sources supporting neighbourhood estimates of population, households and dwellings.

### AGENDA ITEM 3: PROVISIONAL 2002 MID YEAR HOUSEHOLD ESTIMATES

- 2.1 Jan Young summarised the feedback she had received from local authorities during the consultation of the 2002 mid year household estimates. Seven out of the eleven councils who replied to the consultation exercise were happy with the household estimates for their local authorities.
- 2.2 Main points arising were that some local authorities would like to see usage of the council tax register as a base for producing household and dwelling estimates. This source was thought to be give a more accurate indication of trends than the present methodology which requires assumptions to be made about trends in vacancies in the non-LA stock. In addition, the Council Tax Base could provide more up-to-date dwelling and household estimates. Duncan Gray offered to provide members with a summary analysis of the relationship at local authority level between 2001 Census figures on the number of households and numbers of occupied dwellings in council tax base returns. [Action: Duncan Gray]
- 2.3 There was also some concern about the calculation of vacancy rates for non-LA housing stock and of the sharing allowance used from the 2001 Census. It was suggested that some of the results of VFUS should be compared with Census vacancies to see how they compare.
- 2.4 Jan Freeke had provided Cecilia Macintyre with a paper on household estimates for Glasgow. The rest of the HARG group may find this paper of interest. [Action: Cecilia Macintyre to send Jan Freekes paper to the HARG group]
- 2.5 The 2002 mid year household estimated need to be used in the production of 2002 household projections and so the issues raised need to be resolved soon.

## AGENDA ITEM 4: NEED AND POSSIBLE METHODOLOGIES FOR REVISED HOUSEHOLD ESTIMATES FOR 1991 TO 2001

- 3.1 Duncan Gray explained the background of paper HARG 2004(2). GROS have revised their population estimates for 1991 to 2001 and so should we do the same with household estimates? The HARG group were asked for comments on the paper.
- 3.2 Tom Snowling was concerned about the increase in number of vacant properties in Aberdeen city between 1991 and 2001.
- 3.3 Jan Freeke pointed out that it would be sensible to resolve the issues with the 2002 household estimates, in light of comments from the consultation, before we start working on revised estimates for 1991 to 2001. The 1991 Vacant Follow up Survey, student and all visitor household counts should perhaps feed into the revised 1991 Census counts before using for household estimates.
- 3.4 It was agreed that the methodology of the 2002 household estimates would have to be looked at before taking on 1991 to 2001 revised estimates. [Action: Scottish Executive to plan to do revised household estimated for 1991 to 2001 after resolution of issues]

#### AGENDA ITEM 5: HOUSEHOLD ESTIMATES AT NEIGHBOURHOOD LEVEL

4.1 Gillian Miller was unable to attend the meeting and so was unable to talk to the HARG group about her work on Neighbourhood Statistics. However, Duncan Gray explained that some work had been done to compare dwelling counts, from the Census 2001 and the council tax register, at local authority level. There may be value in carrying out a similar task on the Assessor and Census information summarised on the common data zone geography.

### AGENDA ITEM 6: PROGRESS IN UPDATING PROJECTIONS USING CURRENT METHODOLOGY

- 5.1 Duncan Gray outlined the work done so far on revising household projections and asked for comment. The main point was the differences between 1991 Head of Household (HoH) and 2001 Household Reference Person (HRP). GROS provided Housing Statistics with 2001 census data for both definitions and 1991 data for HoH but HRP data for 1991 could only be calculated using 10% of the 1991 database. Projections have been run for both definitions to date.
- 5.2 It was thought that the HRP definition would be the best one to use but as the 1991 data is calculated from 10% of the database, this may not be the best approach for smaller areas such as Orkney or Shetland. Investigation into how small geographical areas are affected by the differences in methodology should be carried out before a decision is made on which definition to use. [Action: Scottish Executive]

5.3 It also may be possible to reduce some anomalies by combining some of the age bands to give less detail. This might pose a problem for the software as we are not sure how the SAS system set up for household projections will cope with such a change.

# AGENDA ITEM 7: DEVELOPING A SPECIFICATION FOR RESEARCH INTO IMPROVING THE METHODOLOGY

- 6.1 ODPM have developed a fairly sophisticated methodology for household projections for England and Wales which provides projections by household type and takes account of cohort effects in addition to trends in household formation rates. From work commissioned from Cambridge University by Glasgow City council and GHA into methodologies for assessing the demand for social housing, there would be benefits in having projections based on the household types used in the ODPM projections, but for 5 year age bands. The potential value in terms of improved quality and more meaningful/ useful household types points to the need for the research to focus primarily on the feasibility of adapting the ODPM methodology for Scotland.
- 6.2 The next steps were:-
  - Development Department to obtain an update from ODPM on their plans for developing household projections for England and Wales. [Action: Scottish Executive].
  - To set up a short life working group from HARG members to assist in drafting the specification for the research. [Action: Scottish Executive].

#### AGENDA ITEM 8: TIMING AND FOCUS OF THE NEXT MEETING

7.1 Jan Young would **consult on and arrange a date for the next meeting of HARG, probably for some time during the last 2 weeks in February [Action: Jan Young].** The next meeting will focus on progress on the household projections and issues with the household estimates.

#### **AGENDA ITEM 9: ANY OTHER BUSINESS**

8.1 There was no other business from anyone in the group.